

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL  
REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SONNY RIOS ROSAS,

Defendant and Appellant.

B279349

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. 6PH07534)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Donald S. Kennedy, Commissioner.  
Affirmed.

Heather E. Shallenberger, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

A petition for revocation of parole filed October 27, 2016 alleged that Sonny Rios Rosas (Rosas) had originally been convicted of oral copulation by force of fear and/or injury and sentenced to 6 years. Rios had also been convicted of the rape of three adult female victims, using violence and gagging all his victims, and of annoying phone calls and obscene threats. Rosas was released on supervision on January 29, 2015, with supervision to expire on October 27, 2018. His parole officer, Sherlonda Washington, stated that he had received, signed and acknowledged his notice and conditions of parole.

The parole conditions included: “ ‘You shall comply with all the instructions from your parole agent.’ ” Washington texted Rosas on October 13, 2016 that she needed his annual Penal Code section 290 sex registration on or before October 18, and he responded, “ ‘you’ll have it!’ ” On October 18 Washington texted Rosas to be at her office by 1:00 p.m., and he responded in part that he was moving to Long Beach “which means it is out of your jurisdiction! So get a grip woman and go fly a kite!!! Can you feel me girl? I understand you don’t hear very well?” ” At 5:15 p.m. that day, the GPS supervisor left Rosas a voice mail message instructing him to report the next day, October 19. When he did not report on the 19th, Washington texted him again requesting that he report with proof of his registration on the 20th. For the fourth time, Rosas did not report, and Washington located Rosas by his GPS and took him into custody.

Another parole condition was “[y]ou shall be in your approved residence from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.” Rosas had arrived after 10:00 p.m. on October 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, and 19. When Washington texted Rosas to tell him he had arrived late on October 12 and 13, he responded, “ ‘My God Ms. Washington do you swim in negative waters? Let me ask you . . . who is your daddy? This metaphor is real simple . . . Do you serve Jesus Christ or Satan? . . . “[G]et a grip woman” and ask yourself why you hate your job?’ ”

A third parole condition was that Rosas charge his GPS device twice a day for at least one full hour each time. He did not fully charge his GPS on October 11, 14, 16, and 20, when the device went into low and then critical battery modes.

The report recommended that Rosa be returned to custody for 135 days for his failure to comply with parole conditions.

At a hearing at which Washington and Rosas testified, his attorney submitted with regard to the truth of the allegations. The trial court found by a preponderance of the evidence that Rosas had violated the conditions of parole supervision, and revoked and restored the parole with the same terms and conditions with the modification that Rosas was sentenced to 135 days in county jail, with a total of 82 days custody credit. Rosas filed a timely notice of appeal.

We appointed counsel to represent Rosas on appeal. After examining the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to review the record

independently. On March 30, 2017, we advised Rosas he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. To date, we have received no response.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that Rosas's counsel has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109–110; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

#### **DISPOSITION**

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

JOHNSON, J.

We concur:

CHANEY, Acting P. J.

LUI, J.